

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DEBORAH JONES,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 4:10-1876-MBS-TER
vs.	)	
	)	
SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT	)	<b>ORDER</b>
OF CORRECTIONS, a Political	)	
Subdivision of the State of South	)	
Carolina; LEATH CORRECTIONAL	)	
INSTITUTION, a division of the South	)	
Carolina Department of Corrections;	)	
VALERIE HILL AND KAREN HAIR,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

Plaintiff Deborah Jones, an inmate in the South Carolina Department of Corrections, brought this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging she was retaliated against in violation of her First Amendment Right to freedom of speech for reporting an inappropriate relationship between an inmate and a guard.

This matter is before the court on motion for summary judgment filed by Defendants on March 17, 2011. (ECF No. 17.). Pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), Plaintiff was advised of the summary judgment procedure and the possible consequences of failing to respond adequately. Plaintiff filed a response in opposition to Defendants' motion on June 1, 2011 (ECF No.22.) Defendants filed a reply on June 13, 2011 (ECF No. 23.) In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this case was referred to United States Magistrate Thomas E. Rogers for a Report and Recommendation. On January 24, 2011, the Magistrate Judge

filed a Report and Recommendation in which he recommended that Defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted. Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility for making a final determination remains with this court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portions of the Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or may recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

The court has thoroughly reviewed the record. The court concurs with the Magistrate Judge's recommendations and incorporates the Report and Recommendation herein. Defendants' motion for summary judgment is granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Margaret B. Seymour  
Chief United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina  
February 8, 2012